

REMARKS

In accordance with the forgoing, claims 1 and 15 have been amended. Claim 29 has been added. Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17-23, 25, 26 and 28-29 are pending and under consideration. The following remarks are respectfully submitted.

I. Double Patenting

The Examiner has variously provisionally rejected the claims under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Since it is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patent, Applicants will wait to respond to the rejections until claims have issued.

II. Rejections Under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 13, 15-17, 19-21 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,769,671 to Lim ("Lim"). Applicants respectfully assert that the claims of the present invention are patentably distinguishable from Lim and the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 2, 16, and 27 were previously canceled, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Independent claims 1 and 15 include the limitations of first and second deflection portions which "extend outward from the at least one of the first inner surface and the second inner surface" of a housing member. The deflection portion serves to "deflect[] the connector clip, prior to insertion of the lead between the first arm and the second arm, from a first position corresponding to a first distance between the first arm and the second arm, to a second position corresponding to a second distance between the first arm and the second arm, **wherein the second distance is greater than the first distance.**"

(emphasis added) Lim fails to teach or suggest these limitations. Lim teaches a spring that "is a generally closed shape member defined by opposed free ends 31 and 33 which in the relaxed condition, define a gap referenced in FIG. 5 as 29. In the assembled condition of the connector and before the lead is introduced into the opening 10, the free ends of the spring maintain a spacing of approximately 0.005 inch." (col. 4, lines 28-33,

emphasis added) The Examiner considers that the relaxed condition, a generally closed shape, is the first position and the second position is when the gap 29 is approximately 0.005 inch.

However, Lim also discloses that the spring is “located within the annular gap 16 to maintain the spring therewithin so that the spring is maintained between the opposed annular end face of the collar member 16 and the stepped surface 18 of the inner bore 6.” (col. 4, lines 51-55) As such, instead of being outwardly deflected as the Examiner suggests, Lim discloses a spring which, is **not deflected outward by any member** prior to insertion of the lead, it may even be deflected inward in its assembled condition by being contained within the cylindrical surface 22, as illustrated in Fig. 2. Instead of gap 29 being increased, as the Examiner suggests, it may be decreased to 0.005 inch due to its confined configuration upon assembly. As such, Lim does not disclose a deflection portion of a housing member which deflects the connector clip, where the distance between the first and second arms is greater when the deflection portion is positioned between the two arms, prior to insertion of the lead.

Additionally, amended independent claim 15 includes the limitations of “the first member having a first outer surface forming an annular shelf **extending radially outward** from an edge of a main surface and terminating at an outer edge of the first member.” (emphasis added) Independent claim 15 also includes the limitation “the annular shelf of the first member [is] formed to receive and fixedly engage with the cylindrical rim of the second member.” Lim fails to teach or suggest these limitations. Lim teaches a “locking collar 24 [] sized so that the collar 24 can be **press fit within** the larger cylindrical inner surface 22 of the stepped bore 6 to effect an interference fit therebetween.” (col. 3, lines 52-56, emphasis added) Lim also teaches that the “locking collar 24 is pressed into open end 15 of the connector and along the cylindrical surface 22 of the stepped bore 6 a distance sufficient to leave the gap 16 the width W between the collar end 30 and the annular shoulder 18 of the bore.” (col. 3, lines 56-60) Further, Lim illustrates the locking collar and the stepped bore configured to fit one inside the other, their only direct contact and engagement thus being through the outer diameter (D3) of the locking collar 24 with the inner diameter (D2) of the stepped bore. (See Figs. 1, 3 and 6) This is unlike the

present invention in which the first and second housing members are fixedly engaged where the cylindrical rim of the second member is received by the annular shelf of the first member.

Dependent claims 3 and 5-7 further define patentably distinct amended independent claim 1. Dependent claims 17 and 19-21 further define patentably distinct amended independent claim 15. Accordingly, these claims are also believed to be allowable.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection and requests allowance of claims 1, 3, 5-7, 15, 17, and 19-21.

III. Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 4, 8-12, 14, 18, 22-26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim. The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 10 and 24 were previously canceled, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Dependent claims 4 and 8-9, 11-12 and 14 further define patentably distinct amended independent claim 1. Dependent claims 18, 22-23, 25-26 and 28 further define patentably distinct amended independent claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection to the claims, and requests allowance of claims 4, 8-9, 11-12, 14, 18, 22-23, 25-26 and 28.

IV. Added Claims

Claim 29 has been added to further define patentably distinct independent claim 1. The limitations of this claim are described in the specifications on page 12, paragraph [0050] and illustrated in Fig. 8B. No new subject matter has been added.

III. Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone either Michael Solder at (763) 526-0938 or Steven E. Dicke at (612) 573-2002 to attend to these matters.

MEDTRONIC, INC.
710 Medtronic Parkway NE
Minneapolis, MN 55432
Customer No. 27581

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew J. Ries et al.,

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-2002
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: **September 4, 2008**

SED:uw

/Steven E. Dicke/

Steven E. Dicke

Reg. No. 38,431